

Cabinet

Meeting held 21 November 2018

PRESENT: Councillors Olivia Blake (Chair), Lewis Dagnall, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Chris Peace, Jack Scott and Jim Steinke

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from the Leader, Councillor Julie Dore.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where it was proposed to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 17 October 2018 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Petition Requesting that the Council Refuse Planning Permission to Build Houses on the Historic Roman Ridge

5.1.1 Bridget Ingle submitted a petition, containing 2,500 signatures, requesting that the Council refuse planning permission to build houses on the historic roman ridge in Wincobank. The petition stated that the petitioners were appealing to their elected representatives on the Sheffield City Council Planning Committee to uphold the 2013 decision of C.J Ball, an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, to refuse the planning application 18/00146/OUT to build 22 houses on the line of the Roman Ridge.

5.1.2 The petition further stated that this 27km ancient earthwork, not yet fully understood or dated, ran along the side of the Scheduled Iron Age Hill Fort at Wincobank. As a Celtic defensive frontier against both the early Roman invaders and the later Saxons, it has the same historic value as Hadrian's Wall and Offa's Dyke. It is a monument of local and national significance.

5.1.3 The petition concluded by stating that the remaining sections were either destroyed, scheduled or under Council protection and this land should be protected too. The petition asked the Council to ensure that this well used section of land (just below the hill fort), already designated as open space, be left fully

accessible for further archaeological investigation and for the benefit, education and enlightenment of future generations.

- 5.1.4 In presenting the petition, Bridget Ingle stated that this was the fourth occasion a planning application had been submitted for the site. Previously, the application was recommended for granting by officers but refused by the Planning and Highways Committee. The developer appealed and this was turned down. She was therefore looking for Council support for refusal of the application.
- 5.1.5 Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, thanked Ms. Ingle for her attendance and the petition. The Cabinet did not have a position on this as such, as it was a decision to be taken by the Planning and Highways Committee and Councillor Scott did not want to influence their decision making.
- 5.1.6 However, Councillor Scott added that he agreed that this was a beautiful part of the City with unique heritage. He understood the frustration within the community at another application having to be fought against. The process did need to be followed correctly though, but if the application was refused the Council would do its best to support the community and try to win at any potential appeal hearing. Councillor Scott would welcome a meeting with Ms. Ingle on the issue should she wish.
- 5.1.7 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Planning and Highways Committee for consideration.

5.2 Public Questions in respect of Sheffield's Clean Air Zone Proposal

- 5.2.1 Ibrar Hussain, a taxi driver in the City, referred to the consultation process for the Clean Air Zone proposal. He commented that Transport for London (TfL) had introduced a phased process in London and asked if the Council had considered following that process in Sheffield?
- 5.2.2 Mr Hussain further asked had a detailed plan been prepared for taxi drivers and private hire drivers should the proposal be introduced? Had there been a risk assessment undertaken on the impact to those groups?
- 5.2.3 Mr Hussain commented that a big problem in the City was cross border working where taxi drivers could be licensed in other parts of the country and drive into Sheffield to work. What would happen to them if the proposal was introduced? Mr Hussain did not believe the Highways service within the Council had tried to work with the taxi trade to understand the effect it would have on them.
- 5.2.4 A further big problem in Sheffield, Mr Hussain added, was taxis around Sheffield Railway Station with particular peak times between 4 and 9pm on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. The continuous traffic there was causing problems and better planning was needed to cut emissions. What was the Council's plans in respect of that?
- 5.2.5 With regards to possible Government grants being received to help implement the proposal, Mr Hussain commented that he was aware that Leeds City Council had

been requested to revise their proposals in order to receive the funding from the Government. If Sheffield applied to the Government for £40m to implement the proposal, what share of this would taxis and private hire cars receive in order to mitigate any financial damage to them? If less than £40m was granted to Sheffield, how much would they receive then?

- 5.2.6 In terms of the consultation process, Mr Hussain commented that he believed the report on the agenda for the meeting should state that there would be a meaningful consultation with the taxi trade. He requested that the detailed plan for the proposal be referred to a Council Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee as the impact on the taxi trade was immense. Mr Hussain believed that the Licensing Service at the Council was poor and Hackney Carriage licensing should be separate from private hire car licensing in the way that other licensing regulation was.
- 5.2.7 Ammer Hanif, a local taxi driver, commented that he believed there was a lot of ignorance about the taxi trade. They earned about the same as the national minimum wage and, should the Council's proposal be implemented, their earnings would be below even that. Taxi drivers provided a vital service for the community and he did not know why those who could least afford it were being targeted.
- 5.2.8 Mr Hanif did not believe the Licensing Service was fit for purpose. He and many of his colleagues were being penalised for playing by the rules. If Mr Hanif obtained a license from TfL he could circumvent Sheffield's requirements and if the proposal was implemented it would encourage others to do the same.
- 5.2.9 Lee Ward, representing Alpha, a private hire taxi association, commented that there were 185,000 private vehicles in the City, and 3,000 were licensed in Sheffield. He questioned what policy could improve air quality if it was only targeting 3,000 vehicles? He believed the Council was too scared of charging everyone, but, in his opinion, everybody was contributing to the pollution so everybody should pay. Mr Ward believed that this proposal was a political decision and not a clean air decision.
- 5.2.10 In response, Councillor Jack Scott commented that he had considered a phasing process. That, however, would mean starting a year earlier, rather than a year later and he did not believe taxi drivers would welcome that. This proposal was setting out a trajectory and identified a solution which would get the City to having legally compliant air. There were far more details to work out in the period ahead and he welcomed comments regarding areas where further work was needed.
- 5.2.11 Councillor Scott wanted people to understand that there was a big public health crisis within the City and across the country by not having clean air. The Council did take action on cross border working and Councillor Scott would be happy to exclude drivers not licensed in Sheffield from the bus lane bonus. However, he hadn't identified a legally practical way of achieving that as yet and further work would be done to look into this.
- 5.2.12 Councillor Scott accepted Mr Hussain's comments in respect of the Railway Station and stated that a masterplan was being developed for the whole Station.

However, this was private property and not Council property. The electrification of Midland Mainline and improvements to the taxi fleet would help. Without the electrification there needed to be improvements to the taxi fleet as there were comparatively limited private car movements in the area, and these tend to be cleaner.

- 5.2.13 If the Council did not receive sufficient funding from the Government to support the proposal, it would not proceed with the plan it had outlined. The Council needed to put in place appropriate investment, grants, loans, guidance, advice and support for taxi drivers. If that was in place Councillor Scott would not support fare rises to pay for charges.
- 5.2.14 Councillor Scott accepted that the Licensing Service at the Council had been cut back and was now very lean. However, growing this would have to be paid for and would most likely mean an increase in licensing fees. He did not disagree that the proposal had the potential to have a massive impact on the taxi trade. However, he hoped that appropriate advice, support, guidance and investment would resolve this. He understood that, at this time, it appeared that the Council were adopting a “stick” approach. However, he believed that over time it would not look like that, when the full package of incentives and support was known.
- 5.2.15 Councillor Scott added that, overall, the taxi fleet in Sheffield was too old and the City needed to work together to get it cleaner. He did not turn a blind eye to infringements of licensing regulations, so if people were aware of specific examples, they should be reported to him.
- 5.2.16 In conclusion, Councillor Scott commented that this was a long standing problem and he did not see an alternative other than the Council’s proposal at this stage, as the City needed a clean, reliable and safe taxi fleet. He believed that the report on the agenda for the meeting would start a discussion amongst interested parties and the proposal would become clearer over time.

5.3 Public Question on the Ethical Procurement Framework

- 5.3.1 Christine Rose commented that the Women’s Equality Party welcomed the Council’s development of an Ethical Procurement Framework. Following on from the Party’s question at last month’s Cabinet meeting on the Gender Pay Gap, would the Council consider incorporating the following into the Framework. This would acknowledge the inequalities identified by the Gender Pay Gap statistics, encourage organisations across Sheffield to address it and to strengthen women’s economic outcomes:-

(i) Page 11 – Principals of the ethical code of conduct for suppliers point 3 living and minimum wages – ADD ‘gender pay gap’

(ii) Page 14 Appendix 2; Social Value in Tenders

Tackling Inequalities box – ADD ‘To work towards reducing the gender pay gap, ensuring that all employees are aware of their organisation’s track record and have the means to challenge it on an individual basis.’

- (iii) Page 15 – Tackling Inequalities box – ADD ‘How will you work to reduce any inequalities identified in your gender pay gap report?’
- 5.3.2 Ms. Rose concluded by commenting that the Party would welcome a meeting with Councillor Blake and the relevant Officers to discuss this.
- 5.3.3 Councillor Blake, Cabinet Member for Finance, commented that she welcomed Ms. Rose’s suggestions and agreed that a meeting would be useful to discuss this further, as some of the work may overlap with Government initiatives. The Ethical Procurement Framework was only signed off in March this year. A review would be done in due course to ensure that it was still relevant. There were issues with some of the Council’s outsourced services. Some historically gendered roles need to be challenged from an equality perspective. Councillor Blake’s office would be in touch with Ms. Rose to arrange a meeting.
- 5.4 Public Question in respect of Birley Spa Asset of Community Value
- 5.4.1 Nigel Slack commented that barely was the ink dry on the paperwork designating Birley Spa as an ‘Asset of Community Value’ than the Friends Group had been advised that it will be put on the market in 6 months time, the absolute minimum moratorium under the ACV legislation. Mr Slack hoped that it was not intentional on the part of Property Services, but this would feel like a deliberate kick in the guts for those who worked so hard to try and save this heritage building for the community, including some Councillors. As owners of the property, the Council could presumably allow up to the full 5 years for the ACV to lapse, but have chosen to allow only this mean and minimal opportunity for the community to organise, raise funds and then bid for this building. Why has this step been taken in quite such a seemingly uncaring way?
- 5.4.2 Councillor Olivia Blake responded that there appeared to be a bit of a misunderstanding in respect of the Asset of Community Value process. As the landowner, the Council had to give notification of its intention to dispose. This was a procedural matter and not aimed at the Friends Group. The Council had been clear that it wanted a timely process of bringing the building back into use and waiting 5 years could lead to further deterioration.
- 5.4.3 The Council had arranged a meeting with the Friends Group for 6 December and would continue to provide support to the Group. The notification of the intention to dispose had not been done to undermine the work the Council was doing with the Friends Group. There was a 6 week period to delay any sale of the building if the Friends Group notified the Council of its intention to bid. This started the clock ticking and the Group then had six months to complete the sale. This announcement did not mean the Council was selling the building at the moment and was just to signify that that was the ultimate intent.
- 5.5 Public Question in respect of Mount Pleasant
- 5.5.1 Nigel Slack stated that the guardians who had kept Mount Pleasant safe and secure for the last many years, had been evicted. However, it seemed unclear

whether the sale to Hermes Care was yet complete and consequently who would be responsible for the building once vacant. Will the Council confirm the stage the sale has reached? What interim security will be in place once the guardians have vacated the buildings? What conditions were included in the contract to ensure the building was restored, rather than demolished, in the event of any unfortunate accident whilst the property was unprotected?

5.5.2 Councillor Olivia Blake confirmed that the Council was currently in negotiations with Hermes Care and was hopeful that contracts would be exchanged shortly. The building would not be left unprotected and there would be twenty-four hour security. The building was listed, so it could not be demolished. The company who employed the guardians had served notice on the Council and this was related to safety issues. The Council was hopeful that the building would be handed over to Hermes Care sooner rather than later.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Scrutiny

5.6.1 Nigel Slack commented that his previous questions at today's meeting seemed to suggest a lack of joined up thinking and co-operation between Council functions. Councillors in Manchester were complaining of exactly that situation becoming ever more common in their experience and Mr Slack's own conversation with Members indicated that this was not uncommon within this Council.

5.6.2 Mr Slack added that, at the same time, Scrutiny was becoming less and less trusted to do the job of holding the Council to account. The Call-in Scrutiny report being considered at item 7b on today's agenda is perhaps indicative of why. The whole report (excluding preliminaries) is one and a half pages long and, if the words of the decision they were asked to scrutinise are taken out, the report is less than a page. The report gives no detail about the Committee's discussions nor about the way the decision was made (unanimous/split). The decision not to take any action on this Call-in had a couple of caveats but no indication that, if the information finally received was unsatisfactory, there will be any consequence. When will the Council be reviewing the Scrutiny function, in conjunction with the Commons Select Committee report on the effectiveness of local authority overview and scrutiny committees, chaired by Clive Betts MP, to develop something more robust?

5.6.3 Councillor Olivia Blake confirmed that the Council had discussed the report from Clive Betts M.P. and a Council response had been given. Councillor Chris Peace, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, commented that, as a previous Chair of a Scrutiny Committee, she was very familiar with Clive Betts M.P.'s report. The general feeling was that it didn't actually go far enough. The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Chaired by Councillor Denise Fox, had considered the report at its meeting held on 19 July 2018. Councillor Peace had not seen the agenda for the next meeting of the Scrutiny Committee, but hoped there would be some follow up to this. She believed that Scrutiny fulfilled a very important function at the Council.

6. **ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

6.1 Councillor Ben Curran, Chair of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, introduced a report of the Committee reporting the outcome of the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 8 November 2018 where a Call-In of the Cabinet decision taken on 17 October 2018 in respect of the “Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Portion (Local CIL)” was considered.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet notes the decision of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee as follows:-

“The Scrutiny Committee agreed to take no action in relation to the called-in decision but with the caveat;

- that they be given an opportunity to scrutinise the Guidance Note that the Head of Libraries, Community Services, Learning and Skills had been authorised to produce, before it is in effect; and
- that information on the monies gathered through Community Infrastructure Levy be shared with the Committee at an appropriate point in the year along with the calculation of distribution across the City.”

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

7.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That this Cabinet :-

(a) places on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the City Council by the following staff in the Portfolios below:-

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years' Service</u>
<u>People Services</u>		
Denise Berton	Deputy Headteacher, Abbey Lane Primary School	32
Carol Dunger	Clerical Officer, Grace Owen Nursery School	29
Andrea Grubb	Supervisory Assistant, Shortbrook Primary School	29
Lorraine Jackson	Specialist Teaching Assistant	33
Lynne Masterman	Senior Parenting Practitioner	39
Janet Screaton	Higher Level Teaching Assistant (Special) Level 4,	31

Talbot Specialist School

Place

Garry Bedford	Team Leader, Repairs and Maintenance Service	34
Terry Heath	City Centre Ambassador	37
Tony Mason	Plasterer, Repairs and Maintenance Service	46

Resources

Lorraine Butcher	Senior HR Administrator	39
John Tomlinson	Electoral Services Manager	35

(b) extends to them its best wishes for the future and a long and happy retirement; and

(c) directs that an appropriate extract of this resolution under the Common Seal of the Council be forwarded to them.

8. CLEAN AIR FOR SHEFFIELD

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out Sheffield City Council's ambition to make the city's air safe to breathe for all. As agreed in the city's Clean Air Strategy, Sheffield City Council is committed to improving air quality across Sheffield as quickly as possible.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) endorses Sheffield City Council's commitment to cleaning up harmful air in the city to improve the health and life chances of communities across the city;
- (b) recognises that Sheffield and Rotherham's air quality challenge is intrinsically connected and therefore approves the development of a joint air quality plan and package of interventions with Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) to protect and improve the health and wellbeing of people living, working and visiting our areas;
- (c) supports and endorses the evidence and analysis of our air quality challenge that has been developed by Sheffield City Council and Rotherham MBC (working with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and the Department for Transport (DfT)) to fully understand the most significant sources of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) in Sheffield/Rotherham and identify the most challenging locations which breach legal limits for NO₂ pollution;

- (d) approves, in principle, the creation of a charging Category C Clean Air Zone in Sheffield with additional measures (referred to as 'CAZ C+') to, as a minimum, bring Sheffield's air quality within the legal limit for NO₂ concentrations in the shortest possible time.
- (e) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, to jointly submit, with Rotherham MBC, the Sheffield and Rotherham Outline Business Case to Government by 31st December 2018;
- (f) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development and the Director of Financial and Commercial Services, to commence procurement for any necessary infrastructure, goods and services to implement the Clean Air Zone;
- (g) agrees to receive a further Cabinet report on Sheffield's clean air proposals should Government require significant changes once Government has assessed the proposals in our Outline Business Case;
- (h) approves the launch of a statutory consultation in early 2019 on the city's CAZ proposals to tackle NO₂ pollution; and
- (i) agrees to receive a further Cabinet Report on our finalised proposals along with our Final Business Case in 2019.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

- 8.3.1 Based on the outcomes of the Sheffield/Rotherham Feasibility Study, a CAZ C charging zone with additional measures (CAZ C+) is Sheffield's preferred option to achieve legal compliance for the city's NO₂ emissions in the 'shortest possible time'.
- 8.3.2 There is increasing evidence that air pollution has profound implications for the health and life chances of people, particularly more children, older people and lower income communities. Further, air pollution undermines people's quality of life, causing asthma and increasing the chances of hospital admissions, visits to A&E, respiratory and cardiovascular disease.
- 8.3.3 The introduction of a CAZ C+ will deliver a rapid impact on the city's ambitions to make our air safe to breathe for all. Further, taking steps to address emissions from the most polluting vehicles on Sheffield's roads through a CAZ C+ has the potential for Sheffield to access significant Government resource to support the upgrade and replacement of vehicles, investment which would otherwise not be available to us.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 8.4.1 The development of our preferred option of a charging CAZ C+ to deliver an

immediate impact on the city's air quality has involved a thorough and detailed appraisal of air pollution, traffic flows and planned development in the city to understand the interventions that we need to introduce to bring the city's air quality into within legal limits in the shortest possible time.

8.4.2 What the Feasibility Study has shown is that 'doing nothing' is not an option for Sheffield. This is because of the following:

- Sheffield and Rotherham have been mandated by Government and therefore have a legal duty to reduce NO₂ emissions to within legal limits (40µg/m³) in the shortest possible time. Failure to do so would likely result in legal action and potentially significant fines.
- Our modelled data demonstrated that there are multiple sites in the city centre and Lower Don Valley that are currently in breach of the legal limits for NO₂ pollution. The national change in the vehicles on the city's roads (drivers/businesses upgrading and replacing their vehicles over time) will not be sufficient to bring NO₂ emissions within legal limits by 2021 and therefore, further intervention is needed.
- More critically, there is an established and increasing scientific evidence base that demonstrates that exposure to air pollution has a devastating effect on human health. In Sheffield, it is estimated that poor air quality contributes to 500 deaths a year but it also undermines the quality of life for people in the city. Poor air quality impacts on the day-to-day lives and life chances of our communities, for example, 7-12% of annual childhood asthma cases were specifically attributable to traffic related air pollution and it increases the chances of hospital admissions, visits to A&E and respiratory and cardiovascular disease. Therefore, urgent action is needed to reduce exposure to air pollution in Sheffield.
- Sheffield City Council's Clean Air Strategy sets out an ambition to deliver clean air for all in the city and this includes a commitment to 'focus on the biggest causes of air pollution and improve them as quickly as possible'. Delivering a CAZ with Government funding to support the drivers that are most exposed to the charging zone will be vital to achieve our clean air ambitions.

8.4.3 Given that 'doing nothing' is not an option because of the scale of pollution and the legal directive to reduce NO₂ emissions in the shortest possible time, assessed options for Sheffield and Rotherham have been as follows:

- **CAZ with no charging** – assessed to not deliver the impact needed in the shortest possible time.
- **Charging CAZ A (non-compliant buses, taxis)** – incentivises change for two of the most polluting vehicles but insufficient to bring air quality within the legal limit in the shortest possible time at multiple sites across the city's road network because of emissions from HGVs and LGVs.
- **Charging CAZ B (non-compliant buses, taxis, HGVs)** – incentivises change for three of the most polluting vehicles but insufficient to bring air quality within the

legal limit in the shortest possible time at multiple sites across the city's road network because of emissions from LGVs.

• **Charging CAZ D (non-compliant buses, taxis, HGVs, LGVs, private cars)** – whilst a charging CAZ D would achieve compliance, our Feasibility Study assessments indicate that a CAZ C with additional measures will achieve compliance in the shortest possible time without charging private car users. It is our judgment that, based upon all the evidence available to us, introducing a CAZ D is not required. A CAZ D in Sheffield would have a significant and disproportionate impact on the city's residents and lower income families in the city. However, if Government assess our preferred option and propose that a CAZ D is required, Cabinet will be provided with a further paper outlining the implications of such a move for the city and the additional resource and mitigations that we would seek from Government.

9. NEW HOMES DELIVERY PLAN

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the broad principles and proposals for a programme for achieving, on average, 2,000 new homes per annum in the areas of Sheffield where they are needed over the next five years, and a longer-term pipeline to sustain this level of delivery.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the New Homes Delivery Plan November 2018 – March 2023 as attached to the report and approves the proposals for a five year funded programme (and pipeline for the next 10 years) that will contribute to achieving, on average, 2,000 new homes per annum in the city; individual business cases for each element of the programme will be approved via the Council's governance and financial approval processes and implementation of any of the initiatives identified may be the subject of further executive decision making in accordance with the Leader's Scheme of Delegation;
- (b) notes that the Council is seeking to secure investment from the "Housing Infrastructure Fund" (HIF), which could provide the funding for the activity identified in the report;
- (c) notes that in the absence of HIF investment being sufficient for the activity identified, a further Cabinet report will be produced to set out and authorise alternative investment options;
- (d) delegates authority to the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services and the Director of Legal & Governance, to negotiate and agree terms for the acquisition of properties for the purpose of shared ownership as described in the report; and
- (e) requests the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services, in

consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, to present a further report in 2019 setting out proposals for a new Affordable Housing Strategy, including Quality Standards and 5 Year Programme which will be reviewed annually by Cabinet.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 With further investment it is anticipated that the following outcomes could be achieved (subject to project / programme specific approvals). The Council can undertake a number of interventions as outlined in the New Homes Delivery Plan, to build approximately 2,000 new homes as a minimum in the next 5 years. For example:

- The Council will build a minimum of 1600 affordable new homes, through the HRA Stock Increase New Build Programme and will aim to increase this further through securing external funding from Government and a review of the HRA debt cap regulations.
- A further 11 Council owned sites could be developed by the Council or marketed, accelerating over 400 new homes in the next 5 years and 1000 new homes across all tenures.
- Sheffield Housing Company could accelerate the delivery of a further 350 new homes in this period.
- Strategic acquisitions will commence on a rolling programme in the city centre housing zone, to unlock sites with the potential for 500 homes in the next 5 years.
- Provide the opportunity to work in partnership with Rotherham to develop the pipeline for the Sheffield/ Rotherham corridor that could achieve over 18,000 homes over the next 20-30 years.
- The pace of new build will be a combination of directly working with the private sector and simplifying advice for the private sector to get on and deliver new homes.
- The proposed investment is estimated to generate the equivalent amount of increased income to the Council.
- A greater supply and variety of houses to help balance the citywide shortfalls.
- With a dedicated Housing Growth Delivery Team there will be opportunities to enable and accelerate housing growth through the private sector, by promoting site opportunities, problem solving on stuck schemes and promoting the city as a place for housing investment.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

9.4.1 The main alternative considered was to not develop the Delivery Plan. This was rejected because:

- Without interventions the delivery of housing by the private and public sectors

is forecast to fall significantly short of the scale of new homes delivery needed in the city.

- Without interventions the narrow types and tenures of housing currently being delivered by the private sector are expected to remain and continue to fail to meet the housing needs of current and future households in Sheffield.
- General uncertainty in the housing market could reduce delivery.
- Fragmented land use patterns make it difficult to deliver a co-ordinated package of infrastructure solutions necessary to support new communities. The strategic acquisition of land as one of the programme interventions being proposed will help to address this issue.
- The lack of resources to co-ordinate proposals and the lack of strategic funding means that future infrastructure solutions could continue to be delivered in isolation and infrastructure solutions fail to impact positively. The delivery of physical infrastructure solutions as one of the programme interventions being proposed will help to address this issue and enable, unlock or accelerate housing delivery.

10. BUILDING BETTER PARKS STRATEGY

- 10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking agreement for the Parks and Countryside Service Building Better Parks Strategy. The Strategy is intended to be used as a framework for decision making to assist with maximising the benefits derived from our land and property portfolio.
- 10.2 Cabinet agreed to remove the following wording from under the first bullet point in paragraph 1.2 of the report (on page 110 of the agenda pack) 'plus a further £1.2m commitment for the three years from 2020-2023 (subject to budget approval).' to read '£2.0m Public Health Funding 2018-2023, which includes an amount of £800k already committed for 2018/19 and 2019/20.'
- 10.3 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet approves the Parks and Countryside 'Building Better Parks Strategy' report to establish the strategic framework which will guide decision making on the use and management of the Parks and Countryside Service land and property portfolio.
- 10.4 **Reasons for Decision**
- 10.4.1 This preferred option means that the Parks and Countryside Service can develop a new strategic approach which will deliver investment proposals for our green spaces for the next five years. The Strategy will seek to sustain and improve our green spaces, especially in the city's areas of greatest health inequality.
- 10.4.2 The preferred option will improve facilities; allow Parks and Countryside to engage with new business partners to secure new business opportunities, generate much needed income to sustain the Service whilst also securing investment for underutilised land and property, all subject to Legal Services,

Corporate Property, Procurement, Business Sheffield, Licensing and Planning guidance.

10.4.3 There is an opportunity to make a change that demonstrates both ambition and showcases the possibilities for Parks and Countryside land and property.

10.4.4 There is an opportunity to encourage organisations to exercise their social value, through sponsorship, by investing in under-utilised parks by providing new assets. Private and Third Sector organisations will be invited to further generate income through the sponsorship of existing assets.

10.4.5 The Council also wants to use its assets to enable positive social and economic outcomes whilst delivering a better service. It is therefore essential that the Parks and Countryside Service adopts a strategic approach to the management of its assets

10.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.5.1 The alternative option would be to do nothing. This would impact on the opportunity of investment, potential revenue income and improving the customer experience within Parks and Open Spaces. This would also lead to a significant decrease in public satisfaction with the general quality of Sheffield's Parks and Green Spaces and will affect the opportunity for Sheffield's Parks to be a major contributory factor to people's health, providing places that bring people together and act as the focus for community activity. It will also have a negative effect on the look and feel of an area, making it a less attractive place to live, work, invest or study.

11. **RIPON STREET RECREATION GROUND - TRANSFER OF CHARITABLE STATUS TO DARNALL COMMUNITY PARK**

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking Cabinet approval for the transfer of charitable status (Charity No.1105522) of land in the ownership of the Council from land at Ripon Street Recreation Ground to land at Darnall Community Park .

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) as Trustees of the Ripon Street Recreation Ground (Charity no.1105522) and in accordance with the powers contained in the provisions of the Trust of Land and Appointment of Trustees Act 1996, gives approval for the transfer of charitable status from Ripon Street Recreation Ground, Attercliffe to Darnall Community Park, in accordance with the terms of this report and a surveyors report prepared in accordance with section 119(1) of the Charities Act 2011;

(b) delegates authority to the Chief Property Officer to instruct the Director of Legal and Governance to prepare and complete all necessary legal documentation in accordance with the agreed terms and Charity

Commission requirements to implement this transfer;

- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Legal and Governance to take such steps and enter into such documents as are required in order to effect the transfer of land; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Chief Property Officer or the Director of Legal and Governance to give public notice of the proposal in accordance with Section 121 of the Charities Act 2011.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 It is the opinion of officers that the transfer of the charitable status from Ripon St is of greater benefit for the objects of the Trust than simply selling the land and reusing the proceeds.
- 11.3.2 It ensures the future protection of Darnall Community Park to help create and sustain thriving neighbourhoods and communities, improving the health and wellbeing of children and adults.
- 11.3.3 It will help the delivery of the canalside regeneration proposals for the wider Attercliffe Waterside development. This supports the Local Plan, Core Strategy and Corporate Plan policies to deliver new housing and support employment around the canal in Attercliffe and Darnall. This development will also assist with the charitable object to improve the conditions of life for the inhabitants of the area of benefit.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.4.1 Cabinet, acting as Trustees, could decide that it is not considered to be in the best interests of the Charity to transfer the charitable status from Ripon Street to Darnall Community Park and that Ripon Street should simply be sold as proposed in the Cabinet report in 2006. Whilst proceeds from the sale of Ripon Street in future would be available for use within the area of benefit, the physical asset would be lost rather than replaced. In that situation, Darnall Community Park would remain as park due to planning policies but would not have the stronger protection that transferring the charitable status would provide.

12. **PATHWAYS TO PROGRESSION - AMBITION**

- 12.1 The Executive Director, People Services submitted a report informing Members of a successful bid submitted for the Pathways to Progression programme and seeking approval for Sheffield City Council to act as the lead body on behalf of Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Councils in relation to the management of monies received and the activity it supports.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves that Sheffield City Council will act as the accountable body for

the Pathways to Progression programme on behalf of the South Yorkshire local authorities (Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham) subject to the final terms and conditions being the same as those summarised in the report;

- (b) approves the use of the city's employment programmes, Sheffield Working and Sheffield 100, as match funding for the life of the programme - 2019 to June 2021;
- (c) approves agreement being entered into with Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Councils and payments of European Social Fund (ESF) grant being made thereunder; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Executive Director, People Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, to:-
 - (i) agree the terms and conditions and accept the South Yorkshire Pathways to Progression fund in the event that the final terms and conditions are not the same as those summarised in the report; and
 - (ii) agree the procurement strategy and award contracts as required to deliver the outcomes.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

- 12.3.1 Increasing youth employment is a critical challenge for the city which will have long lasting impacts if not addressed. This proposal is designed to make a sustainable difference to young people who may not otherwise have the opportunity or support to pursue further education, employment or training.
- 12.3.2 A failure to address the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged young people is perpetuated in the adult population where those with multiple and complex barriers and those in marginalised communities are overrepresented in the workless cohort.
- 12.3.3 This proposal aims to increase participation in the labour market and thereby improve social inclusion and mobility. It will provide additional opportunities and increase the support available for:
 - 15-18 year olds who are, or are at risk of becoming, NEET
 - marginalised 18+ year olds and those with multiple and complex barriers

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 12.4.1 The Council could decide not to accept the grant. However, at this time there are no known alternative options to consider that offer additional support and funding for these groups and so this option is not recommended.

13. PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS

13.1 The Executive Director, People Services submitted a report informing Members of a successful bid submitted for the Pathways to Success programme and seeking approval for Sheffield City Council to act as the lead body on behalf of Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Councils in relation to the management of monies received and the activity it supports.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves that Sheffield City Council will act as the accountable body for the Pathways to Success programme on behalf of the South Yorkshire local authorities (Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham) and thereby accept the European Social Fund (ESF) grant offer of up to £5,119,800, subject to the final terms and conditions being the same as those summarised in the report;
- (b) approves the use of the city's employment programmes, Sheffield Working and Sheffield 100, as match funding (£1.472m) for the life of the programme - 2019 to 2021;
- (c) approves agreement being entered into with Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Councils and payments of ESF grant being made thereunder; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Executive Director of People Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, to:-
 - (i) agree the terms and conditions and accept the South Yorkshire Pathways to Success fund in the event that the final terms and conditions are not the same as those summarised in the report; and
 - (ii) agree the procurement strategy and award contracts as required to deliver the outcomes.

13.3 Reasons for Decision

13.3.1 Increasing employment levels is a critical challenge for the city which will have long lasting impacts if not addressed. This proposal is designed to make a sustainable difference to individuals who may not otherwise have the opportunity or support to pursue further education, employment or training.

13.3.2 Within the workless cohort those with multiple and complex barriers and those in marginalised communities are overrepresented.

13.3.3 This proposal aims to increase participation in the labour market and thereby improve social inclusion and mobility. It will provide additional opportunities and increase the support available for marginalised 18+ year olds and those with

multiple and complex barriers, particularly those with long-term physical or mental health problems, disabilities or behavioural issues.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 13.4.1 The Council could decide not to accept the grant. However, at this time there are no known alternative options to consider that offer additional support and funding for these groups and so this option is not recommended.

14. **INVESTIGATION OF IMPLICATIONS FOR WATER FLUORIDATION**

- 14.1 The Director of Public Health submitted a report requesting approval from Cabinet to enable the Local Authority to investigate the implications of water fluoridation in Sheffield, including feasibility, costs, plant location, coverage and the implications for other Local Authority areas.

14.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the Local Authority investigating the implications of water fluoridation in Sheffield, including feasibility, costs, plant location, coverage and the implications for other Local Authority areas;
- (b) emphasises that this is purely a fact-finding process to inform subsequent decision-making and that it does not represent a decision by the Local Authority to proceed with water fluoridation; and
- (c) approves that, following the outcome of this investigation, if the Local Authority takes the decision to proceed with the process set out in legislation, all the information gathered will be used as evidence in the formal feasibility report.

14.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 14.3.1 We are asking for agreement to investigate the implications of water fluoridation for Sheffield because we need to understand the costs and extra work needed for the city should we proceed.

- 14.3.2 This first necessary step is to gain an understanding of the public water supply arrangements in the Sheffield area. Key initial questions to be answered by Yorkshire Water are:

- Is it technically practicable for the responsible water company to fluoridate the geographic area of Sheffield?
- Will doing so necessitate also fluoridating other adjacent localities and, if so, will this involve other local authority areas?

- 14.3.3 Depending on discussions with the water company this may be essentially a desk-top exercise, thereby minimising initial costs. It should be emphasised that

this is purely a fact-finding process to support subsequent decision-making and that it does not represent a decision by the Local Authority to proceed with fluoridation.

- 14.3.4 Once the investigation has taken place and the full implications of the cost and infrastructure are available, further discussions will take place as to whether to progress to the legislative stage of the process. Should this be the case, a full report will be brought back to Cabinet for discussion and agreement made to progress further or not.

14.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

None

15. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2018/19 MONTH 6

- 15.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the budget monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for 2018/19, as at 30 September 2018.

15.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report and attached appendices on the 2018/19 Revenue Budget Forecast;
- (b) in relation to the Capital Programme, notes the forecast Outturn position described in Appendix 6 of the report; and
- (c) approves the requests for funding within Appendix 7 of the report namely:-
 - (i) £2.1m funding relating to Place Change Programme on an invest-to-save basis; and
 - (ii) £2.7m of additional funding to enable further reductions in the number of patients that are medically ready to leave hospital but are delayed because they are waiting for adult social care services.

15.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 15.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

15.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 15.4.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue

Budget and the Capital Programme.

16. MONTH 6 CAPITAL APPROVALS

16.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 06 2018/19.

16.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts;
- (b) approves the acceptance of accountable body status of the grant funding detailed in Appendix 2 of the report; and
- (c) in accordance with the details in Appendix 3 of the report, delegates authority to the Head of Commercial Business Development, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance, to:-
 - (i) accept ERDF funding in respect of the Grey To Green 2 project if offered;
 - (ii) authorise the corresponding budget increase to the project; and
 - (iii) award the resulting increased construction contract..

16.3 Reasons for Decision

16.3.1 The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.

16.3.2 To formally record changes to the Capital Programme and gain Member approval for changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the Capital Programme in line with latest information.

16.3.3 Obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

16.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

16.4.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

17. GAMBLING ACT 2005 - STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES (POLICY)

17.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the details of the revised Statement of Principles (Policy) to be published under the Gambling Act 2005 and details of the consultation process that has been undertaken. The report sought approval on the final version of the Statement of Principles (Policy) and for it to be referred to Full Council.

17.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet approves the Statement of Principles (Policy) for referral to Full Council on 5 December 2018.

17.3 Reasons for Decision

17.3.1 Our recommendation is that Cabinet approve the Statement of Principles (Policy) for referral to Full Council on 5 December 2018.

17.3.2 The reason for this recommendation is to ensure compliance with the Council's statutory obligations and in doing so promote the Council's Corporate Plan and support the Council's vision.

17.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

No further alternative options considered.

(Note: This is subject to approval at Full Council at its meeting to be held on 5 December 2018 and is not subject to call-in).

This page is intentionally left blank